

January 29, 1975

NRD's, the county boards, just about every agency of state government you could think of has been brought specifically into the hearings to explain what they think the problems are if there are problems and what the solutions are, where control for any land-use should be given if you are going to have such a program and an overview has been developed. In other words, these are things that we have done. Report on the existing available data base for a state land-use program. Once again, this is something the committee has done. They actually have a presentation ready to make to the Legislature after two years of study. Item #4, identify any data base requirements necessary for a state land-use program. Again it's something we have actually physically completed at this time. These are all preliminaries that go into any land-use program and so we've done these. Now you might ask, well now's come you've already done this and here is a bill wanting to redo it. We've done it because an identical bill was turned into a resolution by this Legislature sitting as a whole and the Agriculture Committee was specifically directed to do almost everything listed in this bill. So what the bill seeks to do then is redo precisely what has been done. Now what I think Senator Bereuter should do is come and go over the data with us, present more data if he has disagreements, present amendments to our bill if he has disagreements there, but to start out in a completely different direction seems a little improper. Ok, the bill has another six or seven items all in this same vein. In other words, one of them is to identify the proper role of state government in a state land-use planning program. We directed a lot of our attention to this and concluded, for example, that local county boards should be the fundamental building block in any land-use program. And so the very things this bill seeks to do, we spent a couple of hundred thousand, probably, already doing and we have had every agency of state government involved and every element of the private business community. Now Senator Bereuter uses as his final argument that this should not be interpreted by the body as a precedent. Ok, the bill in every sense of the word is a land-use bill. A land-use bill by precedent was referred to the Agriculture Committee, number one. Number two, a land-use resolution was then passed by the Legislature as a whole. A majority of those, of the elected members passed it. Once again it was sent to the Agricultural Committee and they were directed to come up with a program. Next, item number three for precedent, a Reference Committee of the Legislature set up by the Rules referred the bill to the Agriculture Committee in light of the study and work done. Then there was a contest of that reference, item number four, and in the contest the vote was overwhelming after hearing the evidence of Senator Bereuter to submit it back to the Agriculture Committee and so if it would not be precedent to reject all these votes and all this work that's been done, then precedent has no meaning on this floor. This is the first serious test this year of whether this Legislature is going to give meaning to its committee, the Reference Committee, whether it is going to give meaning to previous action, votes, and work done by this Legislature or whether we are going to start going out on a whimsey and a fling and trying to humor individuals because they feel that a proposal that a particular committee has come up with is now not in alignment with theirs and they want--they want to get it repudiated somehow and so it would be a very definite precedent and a very dangerous one and I think